(B)(I) the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence; and

27

28

(ii) the facts underling the claim, if proven and viewed in the light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable fact finder would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense.

28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A)-(B). The statute also provides that, "[b]efore a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's request that this court transfer his petition to the Ninth Circuit is **DENIED**. If petitioner wishes to pursue an habeas corpus remedy, he must first file a motion in the Ninth Circuit requesting an order authorizing this court to consider a second or successive petition.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED** without prejudice as an unauthorized second or successive petition. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and to close this case.

DATED this 14th day of July, 2010.

LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Sihr